

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the final Office Action mailed April 29, 2004. Applicant appreciates the Examiner's consideration of the Application. In order to advance prosecution of this Application, Applicant has responded to each notation by the Examiner. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

Section 102 Rejection

The Examiner rejects Claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,397,259 to Lincke et al. ("*Lincke*"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for the reasons discussed below.

Applicant respectfully submits that *Lincke* fails to disclose, or even teach or suggest, the elements specifically recited in Applicant's claims. For example, *Lincke* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest, "the second request generated by transforming a uniform resource identifier portion of the first request to include information from the header portion of the first request," recited in Applicant's independent Claims 1 and 10.

Lincke discloses data compression techniques to enable wireless communications devices to complete transactions by exchanging a minimum number of data packets. (*Lincke*, Abstract, lines 3-6.) A compact transfer protocol (CTP) is used to communicate between a wireless communications device and a proxy server. (*Lincke*, column 8, lines 23-25.) According to *Lincke*:

CTP is designed to minimize the amount of data that is sent over the network between the wireless client 405 and proxy server 180. In order to achieve its minimal size, it uses binary fields to represent request and response parameters, instead of text like most Internet 190 protocols do. Hence, CTP is not human readable like HTTP, but it is very compact.

(*Lincke*, column 65, lines 49-55.)

Lincke also discloses:

Turning to the query and response elements, the wireless CTP query 122 represents a compact transfer protocol (CTP) formatted query from the wireless communications device 100. The base station 170 receives this query and forwards it to the proxy server 180. The forwarded query is represented by CTP query 124. The proxy server 180 takes the CTP query 124 and converts it into one or more HTTP [sic] queries 126. The web server 140 receives this HTTP formatted query 126 and generates an HTTP response 136

that includes the HTML page 144. The proxy server 180 receives the HTTP response 136, and generates the CTP response 134.

(*Lincke*, column 12, lines 10-26; see also *Lincke*, column 15, lines 56-59.)

That is, *Lincke* discloses converting a CTP query into one or more HTTP queries. *Lincke*, however, does not disclose, teach, or suggest converting a CTP query into a HTTP query by transforming a uniform resource identifier portion of the CTP query to include information from the header portion of the CTP query.

Consequently, at a minimum, *Lincke* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest, “the second request generated by transforming a uniform resource identifier portion of the first request to include information from the header portion of the first request,” as recited in Applicant’s claims. For at least these reasons, *Lincke* fails to disclose the elements specifically recited in Applicant’s independent Claims 1 and 11.

Applicant’s dependent claims are allowable based on their dependence on the independent claims and further because they recite numerous additional patentable distinctions over the prior art. Because Applicant believes he has amply demonstrated the allowability of the independent claims over the prior art, and to avoid burdening the record, Applicant has not provided detailed remarks concerning these dependent claims. Applicant, however, remains ready to provide such remarks if it becomes appropriate to do so.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of independent Claims 1 and 11 and all claims that depend on these claims.

CONCLUSION

Applicant has made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully requests full allowance of all the pending claims.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance prosecution of this case in any way, the Examiner is invited to contact Keiko Ichiye, the Attorney for Applicant, at the Examiner's convenience at (214) 953-6494.

Although Applicant believes no fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicant



Keiko Ichiye
Reg. No. 45,460

KI/lis

Correspondence Address:

Baker Botts L.L.P.
2001 Ross Avenue, Suite 600
Dallas, Texas 75201-2980
(214) 953-6494

Date: June 23, 2004

Customer No. **05073**